

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that it's misdescriptive to claim that the output signal controls the processor device only during startup.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Claim 1.

Here, Claim 1 recites that the processor device is being controlled by the output signal during startup.

It does not recite that it is only during startup and consequently Applicants respectfully traverse the allegation that the claim language is misdescriptive.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagano.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Nagano does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including processor device being controlled by the output signal during startup in independent Claim 1, the processor device being controlled by the control signal during startup in independent Claim 9, albeit defined as the method step of controlling the processor device with the control signal during startup in independent Claim 17.

The Examiner alleges that processor device is deemed intended use.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

It is not seen how the Examiner has reached the conclusion that the processor device is deemed intended use.

In the various forms, all the claims recite that the processor device is controlled by the output signal during startup.

This language is recited in the body of the claim and is clearly a limitation.

Applicants would appreciate an indication of why the Examiner alleges that the processor device being in control by the output signal during startup is a statement of intended use.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 are patentably distinct over the applied reference.


In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is

respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-5633